



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,413	08/31/2001	Mark A. George	NAIIP030/01.153.01	2725
29855	7590	12/20/2004	EXAMINER	
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, P.C. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			COBY, FRANTZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,413

Applicant(s)

GEORGE ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10-01-01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2161

This is in response to applicant's response filed on August 31, 2001 in which claims 1-20 were elected.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on September 26 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claimed feature "an application" should have been --the application--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Geuss et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,782,400.

As per claim 1, Geuss et al. disclose "a method for importing data in a network-based customer relationship application, comprising: identifying data to be imported to a customer relationship application utilizing a network; identifying a set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application; importing the data to the customer relationship application utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54). In particular, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "storing the data in memory accessible to the customer relationship application" (See Geuss et al. Col. 4, lines 15-29; Col. 5, lines 3-8). Last, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein fields in which the data is stored in the memory are customizable by a user" by providing a configuration system that allows a user to designate precise configuration details to locate the data to be transferred (See Geuss et al. Figure 3; Col. 6, lines 23-27).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein an application for importing the data is generated based on the rules" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-

Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54)

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the application runs periodically at user-defined intervals" as import schedule rules that allows the data file to be imported according to a predetermined schedule (See Guess et al. Col. 7, lines 12-19; Col. 4, lines 9-12).

As per claim 4, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the predetermined rules are specified based on user interaction with an application creation program" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature "transforming the data" as translating the data (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, line 60-Col. 3, line 5).

As per claim 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 5. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 5 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of " wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions" through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "exporting data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network" (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, lines 7-8).

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the rules relate to at least one of referential integrity, required fields, and automatic sequence numbering" (See Geuss et al. Figure 3, components 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72) are required fields related to the rules for generating a report.

As per claims 9-10, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In

Art Unit: 2161

addition, Geuss et al. provides a computer program including logic for implementing all the limitations of claim 1 discussed above (See Geuss et al. Col. 5, lines 47-49).

As per claim 11, Geuss et al. disclose “a method for exporting data in a network-based customer relationship application, comprising: identifying data to be exported from a customer relationship application utilizing a network, wherein the data is stored in memory accessible to the customer relationship application; identifying a set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application, exporting the data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules” (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 3, line 26). Also, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of “wherein fields in which the data is stored in the memory are customizable by a user” by providing a configuration system that allows a user to designate precise configuration details to locate the data to be transferred (See Geuss et al. Figure 3; Col. 6, lines 23-27).

As per claim 12, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of wherein a service application for exporting the data is generated based on the rules (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54)

As per claim 13, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 12 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the service application runs periodically at user-defined intervals as import schedule rules that allows the data file to be imported according to a predetermined schedule" (See Geuss et al. Col. 7, lines 12-19; Col. 4, lines 9-12).

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the predetermined rules are specified based on user interaction with a service application creation program" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 15, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions" through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 15. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 15 above.

In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of “wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions” through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 17, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of “exporting data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network” (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, lines 7-8).

As per claim 18, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of “wherein the rules relate to at least one of referential integrity, required fields, and automatic sequence numbering” (See Geuss et al. Figure 3, components 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72) are required fields related to the rules for generating a report.


As per claims 19-20, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 11. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1 and 11. In addition, Geuss et al. provides a computer program including logic for implementing all the limitations of claim 1 discussed above (See Geuss et al. Col. 5, lines 47-49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 571 272 4017. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Saturday 3:00PM-10:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571 272 4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2161

December 9, 2004